

University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

2-8-2010

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 8, 2010

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2010 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 8, 2010" (2010). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 846.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/846

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

02/08/10

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 01/25/10 meeting by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson reported that evening classes for tonight have been cancelled due to the weather.

Provost Gibson reminded the faculty of the Strategic Plan Town Hall meetings, Thursday, February 18 with two sessions, 9:00 - 11:00 A.M. and 3:00 - 5:00 P.M. in Maucker Union Old Central Ballroom, as well as a Friday session, February 19, 2:00 - 4:00 P.M. in the University Room, Maucker Union. The committee is still in discussion on some wording and use of terminology, and the faculty's help will be greatly appreciated.

In response to Senator Soneson's question, a draft of the plan will be posted as soon as possible.

Provost Gibson also noted, regarding the restructuring of the Colleges of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) and the College of Natural Sciences (CNS), that Betty DeBerg, Philosophy & World Religions, and Clifton Chancey, Physics, will serve as the Co-Chairs of the Transition Committee, and they will be working to come up with a process that will come forward by which to elect people to the Transition Committee. She will have more on this process at the next meeting.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan noted that in response to the administration's announcement regarding a planned change in the administrative structure to better supply curricular resources, the merging of CHFA and CNS, leadership from both faculty governance units are meeting to explore ways to help the administration with these changes and to develop proposals for the faculty to consider, regarding faculty governance structures.

The faculty leadership of the Humanities, fine arts, natural sciences, and the social and behavioral sciences, with the leadership of the graduate faculty, will be providing proposals for the faculty and the graduate faculty to consider. The faculty leadership will also be in constant communication with the provost about administrative changes.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz noted that Associate Provost Kopper was unable to attend today's meeting but asked that the Senate be reminded about the open forum on UNI's reaccreditation, Wednesday, February 10, 3:15 P.M. in Maucker Union, Old Central Ballroom.

Chair Wurtz also announced that Associate Provost Kopper will be leaving UNI to serve as Provost at the University of Wisconsin - Whitewater.

In response to Senator Soneson's question about the status of the current reaccreditation process and if someone will be appointed to take over, Provost Gibson replied that in all likelihood there will be co-chairs appointed from the committee. She also noted that there will be an internal search for Associate Provost Kopper's position, which will be announced soon.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

1024 Resolution Regarding Funding of Auxiliary Enterprise Operations at UNI - Hans Isakson

Motion to docket in regular order as item #924 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

1027 Category 3A Review - Fine Arts - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #925 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

1028 Inclusion of 200:030 Dynamics of Human Development to Category 5B of the Liberal Arts Core - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #926 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

1029 Faculty Workload - Jerry Smith

Motion to docket in regular order as item #927 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

1030 Proposal to join the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics - Jerry Smith (<http://coia.comm.psu.edu/aboutcoia.htm>→Membership Info→Top 10 Reasons to Join COIA)

Motion to docket in regular order as item #928 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed with one nay and one abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion followed on how files are sent electronically to senators. It was noted that the Senate is moving toward a more paperless system.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

919 Emeritus Status Request, Larry Hensley, Department of HPELS, effective 12/09

Motion to approve by Senator Roth; second by Senator Bruess.

Motion passed.

920 Emeritus Statue Request, Dennis Kettner, Department of Teaching, effective 12/09

Motion to approve by Senator East; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

921 Emeritus Status Request, John Smith, Department of Education Psychology & Foundations, effective 12/09

Motion to approve by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

922 Curriculum Standards - Jerry Smith

Motion to approve by Senator Smith, noting that the UNI Faculty Senate is hereby requesting that the University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) address the issues discussed here, Inconsistent Terminology, Emphases or majors?, "Embedded" programs, and any other related matters that it deems important, and things that they feel in our basic curriculum standards and process that needs reviewing and improvement. It is further requested that the UCC report to the Faculty Senate by the end of the spring 2010 semester with the results of its deliberations, to include justifications of existing practices and/or recommendations for changes. Second by Senator Soneson.

Discussion followed.

Motion to approve Curriculum Standards as presented by Senator Smith passed.

923 Proposal and Agenda for Reinstatement of University Writing Committee - David Grant, Chair

Motion to approve by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

David Grant, English, Chair, Department of English Language and Literature Writing Committee (ELLWC), was present to discuss this with the Senate.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Faculty Chair Swan suggested amending the motion to approve to move to send this to the UWC and ask for a report back.

Senator East, who made the motion, and Senator Neuhaus who made the second agreed with the amending the motion to read, "move to send this back to the ELLWC for them to formally restart the University Writing Committee, sending them the ELLWC report, and for the University Writing Committee to report back to the Faculty Senate by the end of spring semester with recommendations."

Motion to return this to the English Language and Literature Writing Committee for them to reconvene the University Writing Committee, and for the University Writing Committee to report back to the Faculty Senate by the end of the semester passed with recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

02/08/10

1677

PRESENT: Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Julie Lowell, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Michael Roth, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Megan Balong, Maria Basom, Karen Breitbach, Michele Devlin, Doug Hotek, Bev Kopper, Phil Patton, Chuck Quirk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 01/25/10 meeting by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson reported that evening classes for tonight have been cancelled due to the weather.

Provost Gibson reminded the faculty of the Strategic Plan Town Hall meetings, Thursday, February 18 with two sessions, 9:00 - 11:00 A.M. and 3:00 - 5:00 P.M. in Maucker Union Old Central Ballroom. In response to faculty who are not available Thursday, there will be a Friday session, February 19, 2:00 - 4:00 P.M. in the University Room, Maucker Union. The plan will also be posted online so faculty who can't attend the meetings will be able to respond. She asked Senators to encourage their colleagues to attend. They will be presenting a rough draft of the plan but they do want feedback. As faculty are aware, President Allen charged the Strategic Plan Committee to be bold, and in some areas they have met that expectation. The committee is still in discussion on some wording and use of terminology, and the faculty's help will be greatly appreciated. They have a mission and value statement, and will be breaking into groups at these Town Hall meetings to closely examine each of the goal areas.

Senator Soneson asked if the rough draft is available for faculty to review prior to these meetings?

Provost Gibson replied that it will be posted as soon as possible. The UNI Cabinet currently is reviewing the rough draft. The plan is for the Cabinet to get feedback so the committee can make those revisions and by the beginning of next week it should be available online.

Provost Gibson also noted, regarding the restructuring of the Colleges of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) and the College of Natural Sciences (CNS) that Betty DeBerg, Philosophy & World Religions, and Clifton Chancey, Physics, will serve as the Co-Chairs of the Transition Committee. They met, along with herself and Joel Haack, Dean, CHFA/CNS, last week. Dr. DeBerg and Dr. Chancey will be meeting with the college senates, working to come up with a process that will come forward by which to elect people to the Transition Committee. The plan that they presented to her was that the committee would be comprised primarily of faculty, as she sees this as a faculty driven process as we move forward. She has received emails from faculty regarding this Transition Committee, wanting to make sure that there is opportunity for faculty to be appointed or elected to this committee. Provost Gibson noted she will have more on this process at the next meeting.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the faculty is responsible for faculty governance and the curriculum, and the graduate faculty is responsible for graduate faculty governance and the graduate curriculum.

The administration and the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, are responsible for providing the material resources necessary to actualize the curriculum.

Currently, faculty and curricular structures mirror administrative structures. In order to better supply the resources that can actualize the curriculum, 18 days ago the administration officially announced a planned change in the administrative structure. The administration further requested that the faculty work with it to achieve the best administrative adjustment possible and to consider how the faculty governance structure will relate to a changed administrative structure.

Currently, Faculty Chair Swan continued, there is both an administrative unit serving the curriculum in the Humanities and the fine arts and there is a faculty governance unit comprised of accomplished Humanities scholars and artists. Administratively, another unit, that serving the curriculum in the natural sciences, is being combined with the administrative unit servicing the

curriculum in the Humanities and the fine arts. Leadership from the faculty governance units of the Humanities, fine arts, and natural sciences are now meeting to explore ways to help the administration with its changes, but also to develop proposals for the faculty to consider, regarding faculty governance structures. There is no telling, yet, what the proposals will be, but for the sake of illustration, we can think about the proposal being to leave the faculty structure as is, thereby simply permitting a non-parallel relationship to emerge, between the administrative structure and the faculty governance structure.

The faculty leadership of the Humanities, fine arts, natural sciences, and the social and behavioral sciences, with the leadership of the graduate faculty, will be providing proposals for the faculty and the graduate faculty to consider. The faculty leadership will also be in constant communication with the provost about administrative changes. The provost has said from the beginning that even the administrative changes are to benefit from substantial and substantive faculty involvement. The provost has re-affirmed this with him in every meeting they have had, and he sees much evidence for this, in fact, happening.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz noted that Associate Provost Kopper was unable to attend today's meeting but asked that the Senate be reminded about the open forum on UNI's reaccreditation, Wednesday, February 10, 3:15 P.M. in Maucker Union, Old Central Ballroom. UNI's reaccreditation steering committee will highlight key aspects of the self-study, including the Foundations of Excellent and Higher Learning Commissions work, seek input, and discuss how individuals can submit suggestions for possible revisions of the self-study report, and outline the next steps in completing the reaccreditation process. Input from faculty, staff and students, and their active participation in the next phases of the review process, are critical to UNI's successful reaccreditation.

Chair Wurtz also announced that Associate Provost Kopper will be leaving UNI to serve as Provost at the University of Wisconsin - Whitewater.

Senator Soneson noted that in light of Associate Provost Kopper leaving, and as she is in charge of the reaccreditation process, a major part of what is currently going on, there is a certain amount of uncertainty about the transition. Will someone be appointed to take over? Is there someone that has been working with Associate Provost Kopper that can take over?

Provost Gibson replied that this is a very important process that Associate Provost Kopper has been leading over the last couple of year. She has discussed this with both Associate Provost Kopper and President Allen. In all likelihood there will be co-chairs appointed from the committee. There will also be an internal search, which will be announced soon, for Associate Provost Kopper's position. Associate Provost Kopper will be working through the first week in March, and will attend the Board of Regents (BOR) in March.

Chair Wurtz added that Associate Provost Kopper was recruited by the University of Wisconsin - Whitewater, based on her reputation as well as UNI's.

Provost Gibson commented that the Strategic Plan will be coming to the Senate for their approval this spring.

Senator Soneson suggested appointing several people to do serious reflection on the draft of the Strategic Plan. Not someone who's been involved in the drafting of the plan but leading figures on campus who could reflect and then make a short presentation to the Senate so senators could have some advanced critical reflection.

Provost Gibson replied that her only concern is the time frame, as they have only allowed two hours for these meetings. She noted that the Strategic Plan is not long, approximately 12 pages, and it's certainly doable for people to read before the meeting. There will still be opportunity for faculty's input after the Town Hall meetings.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

1024 Resolution Regarding Funding of Auxiliary Enterprise Operations at UNI - Hans Isakson

Motion to docket in regular order as item #924 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

1027 Category 3A Review - Fine Arts - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #925 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

1028 Inclusion of 200:030 Dynamics of Human Development to Category 5B of the Liberal Arts Core - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #926 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

1029 Faculty Workload - Jerry Smith

Motion to docket in regular order as item #927 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

1030 Proposal to join the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics - Jerry Smith (<http://coia.comm.psu.edu/aboutcoia.htm>→Membership Info→Top 10 Reasons to Join COIA)

Motion to docket in regular order as item #928 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed with one nay and one abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Soneson reported that some senators did not get supporting information for Senator Smith's proposals.

Senator Smith noted that the first item was a word document, which he can send out to senators. The second item was copies from a website.

Senator Soneson remarked that he didn't go to the website.

Senator Smith noted that he will also send out the link to the website.

It was noted that the link to the website for the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, <http://coia.com.psu.edu/aboutcoia.htm> →Membership Into→ Top 10 Reasons to Join COIA was included on the agenda.

Secretary Dena Snowden stated that she'd be more than willing to FAX any document senators do not receive.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate is moving toward a more paperless system.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

919 Emeritus Status Request, Larry Hensley, Department of HPELS, effective 12/09

Motion to approve by Senator Roth; second by Senator Bruess.

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate will leave the table open for future comments post action.

Senator East noted that Dr. Hensley helped him with IRB approvals. He appreciates the effort that Dr. Hensley's has put into that in recent years, and he has been very helpful to him personally.

Motion passed.

920 Emeritus Statue Request, Dennis Kettner, Department of Teaching, effective 12/09

Motion to approve by Senator East; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

921 Emeritus Status Request, John Smith, Department of Education Psychology & Foundations, effective 12/09

Motion to approve by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

922 Curriculum Standards - Jerry Smith

Motion to approve by Senator Smith, noting that the UNI Faculty Senate is hereby requesting that the University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) address the issues discussed here, Inconsistent Terminology, Emphases or majors?, "Embedded" programs, and any other related matters that it deems important, things that they feel in our basic curriculum standards and process needs reviewing and improvement. It is further requested that the UCC report to the Faculty Senate by the end of the spring 2010 semester with the results of its deliberations, to include justifications of existing practices and/or recommendations for changes. Second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Mvuyekure asked if there are cases in which majors serve minors at the same time?

Senator Smith replied that he's not aware of any. Is Senator Mvuyekure asking about cases where a student is awarded a major at the same time as being awarded a minor?

Senator Mvuyekure continued, noting that in his supporting information Senator Smith notes that "Most faculty would be aghast if..." a major happened to serve as a minor at the same time.

Senator Smith responded that he doesn't know of any specific cases.

Siobahn Morgan, Earth Science, stated that there is an Earth Science major that makes use of a minor, Earth Science Interpretive Naturalist major. Part of the major requires an entire minor so students automatically get the minor when they complete that major. The minor is out of a different department. This is the only situation that she's aware of where a full minor is part of a major.

Senator Neuhaus reiterated that when Dr. Morgan says it's "part of that," it's required that students are exclusive in their selection of courses and there's no overlap classes.

Dr. Morgan noted that the minor is out of the Biology Department and the major is in Earth Science.

Senator Smith reiterated that everyone that majors in that automatically gets that minor.

Dr. Morgan responded that that is correct in that Earth Science program.

Senator Smith remarked that there may be justifications for that, and he's open to that. His concern is with situations where there is no justification.

Senator Soneson commented that he believes an examination of consistency is a very important thing across the board so that various programs that UNI offers will mean the same thing when moving from one department in one college to another, and he supports this.

Senator Funderburk noted that he is also in support of looking at programs, and noted that many times accrediting bodies have a lot to do with what something is called and absolute consistency may not be possible.

Senator Neuhaus stated that he is also in support of this but are we setting them up with a Herculean task and deadline?

Senator Smith responded that he wouldn't have a quarrel with extending the deadline. We could do it now or wait until the UCC responds that they need more time.

Provost Gibson noted her concerns with the departure of Associate Provost Kopper, who is Chair of the UCC, and she's not certain what will be happening with that committee. The chair of the committee is elected so hopefully they can get elect a new chair and move on.

Senator East commented that the Senate is not asking for any foregone conclusion; there may well be reasons why things are the way they are and we need to find that out.

Motion to approve Curriculum Standards as presented by Senator Smith passed.

923 Proposal and Agenda for Reinstatement of University Writing Committee - David Grant, Chair

Motion to approve by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

David Grant, English, Chair, Department of English Language and Literature Writing Committee (ELLWC), was present to discuss this with the Senate.

Dr. Grant stated that the English Department's Writing Committee has been working to assess what kinds of things they're doing in regards to the oversight of an implementation of a Liberal Arts Core (LAC) course and one of the things they've realize is that teaching writing is something that can't happen in one semester. There has been at times a University Writing Committee (UWC), and Dr. Karen Tracey, English, has served on that committee but in the last several years that committee has never met, and there was some confusion as to committee membership. They then realized that it is a daunting task and that perhaps past committees got bogged down or were spread too thin, and that there could be numerous reasons for not meeting. They sat down to provide some rationale and focus for a group or body to undertake this in a way that looks at current research in the field, looks toward creating and supporting programs across the campus, and helping establish an academic curriculum central to the university.

Senator Smith asked if there's a sense of what the committee might do, particular initiatives, such as possibly looking to the LAC, the first year experience? Do they have particular ideas and proposals?

Dr. Grant responded that he serves as co-chair of Education Dimension of the Foundations of Excellence self-study and one of the things they noted was that the teaching of writing has to be a very central part education. It can begin the first year; UNI has a strong first year course already in place. However, beyond that students get into all kinds of disciplinary differences, different constraints, modes and genres. The kinds of things they'd like to see are departments assessing and supporting their own needs. This could take place in workshops, providing contacts, looking a places in their curriculum where they could strengthen writing, a lot of different forms that they'd like to see collectively happening.

Senator Smith stated that he strongly supports almost any effort that could be made to improve writing on campus.

One of his specific concerns is that there are students in upper division classes who, in their writing, don't show a mastery of basic mechanics. Those students report that they have taken the appropriate courses, such as College Writing and Research. Maybe they forgot what they learned, or it may not be enforced in certain classes, but there's a sense that in some sections of College Writing and Research the extent to which mechanics are focused on depends on the instructor, with mechanics being treated as less important than releasing your creative spirit. Would this committee undertake an effort to ensure that all of our students coming out of College Writing and Research have a mastery of the mechanics of the English language?

Dr. Grant distributed an article that was published in the Chronicle of Higher Education November 2008, "Writing Is Not Just A Basic Skill" by Mark Richardson. There's a summary of the last fifty years of research into literacy and composition. It was found that teaching students grammar and mechanics through drills often does not work. There are other constraints that go on when you realize that when a person sits down to write they are also crafting their thoughts into a particular form. If part of their brain is working on abstract concepts that they're not familiar with, often times what you'll see is a regression on things of grammar and basic mechanics because another part of their brain is actively trying to work out higher thinking skills. It's certainly important that students understand the role in which mechanics, grammar, structure have and the effect they have. However, it may not be the litmus test as to how well a student can write. You can even point out to a students the common mistakes they're making over and over but going over the rules is not going to guarantee that they'll "get it." However, by pointing out that there are resources online, or on campus, that they can go to the student can be charged with taking responsibility on their own.

Senator Smith noted that while a student's brain is busy on the content and writing it down, they then have to switch the brain to the mechanics to be sure it's right. There may be one writing but two times to look at it.

Dr. Grant added that ideally they have several times to look at it because writing is a process, constantly going back, constantly revising. These are the kinds of things that the committee feels are not always consistently

advised across the curriculum, that these messages are not always reinforced. It seems that there are a lot of mixed messages about writing for students and students often end up getting confused and frustrated.

Senator Smith noted that he wished there was a consistent message and that it was that mechanics matter. His concern is that he gets the sense that some people who teach writing don't get that message across. He certainly grades for content, he wants the content but if it's poorly written it will hurt that student's grade. And if you do this out in the world you'll lose a lot of credibility with your audience.

Chair Wrutz stated that where she runs into problems with referring students, business students, to another source is that as a manager your work is not going to have value until a lesser paid subordinate employee fixes it. Just how much respect are you planning on having in the work place? Students have to have basic writing structure skills; we can't be teaching them to rely on someone else to proof their work.

Senator East commented that he's concerned that there are problems across campus that we don't all speak a similar language about writing. Is it feasible for that the UWC might give us some common recommendations or terminology about what to look at or expect in student writing? As someone who writes okay but doesn't really know how to talk about writing, it's hard for him to deal with students and their writing in what he considers a reasonable, knowledgeable or effective way.

Dr. Grant responded that that's a good point, that often times faculty have knowledge and expertise in one area, and what kinds of pedagogical initiatives could one do that would highlight writing issues? And to do that in ways that are attentive to different contexts, for example the humanities versus the sciences.

Senator East remarked that one thing specifically that he was thinking about was critique terminology, such as construction, organization, and flow. He's used some of those words but really has no idea what they necessarily mean or communicate. If faculty can communicate to students in a similar way across campus it might be useful.

Senator Van Wormer commented that the best way to learn to write is through reading and wondered if there could be an alternative for students who have the mechanics from high school where they could take a literature course with focus on reading?

Dr. Grant replied that the English Department has been offering writing-enhanced sections of "Introduction to Literature" that satisfy LAC 1A, the writing requirement, as well as LAC 3B (Philosophy and Religion has been offering similar sections of "Religions of the World").

Senator Soneson noted that learning how to write well is one of our major tasks here at UNI. He doesn't believe one course can do the trick. This committee used to be called something like "Writing Across the Curriculum" which would seem to be a very effective way of thinking about learning how to write in college. The proposal recommends that committee membership remain with representatives from each of the colleges, and that would mean the encouragement of faculty in all departments to place a emphasis on writing. Such faculty would have to learn how to be self-conscious of writing. In the past there have been workshops with that kind of faculty development. If we just expect the English Department to do it all we will see writing become a miserable failure. He not only encourages this writing committee, he encourages the UWC to find ways of reaching out into the university to encourage and support faculty in every department to engage in writing instruction, and not just having students write papers but be able to read, comment and talk with students about their writing and in the same way writing teachers do. There's lots of literature out there and it would be good for both faculty and students.

Kenneth Baughman, English, ELLWC member, added that they envisioned the UWC continuing the kind of conversation that's currently being discussed, being a forum where faculty from all colleges and representing all departments can discuss ways in which there can be more writing activities that will be useful to students and ways in which faculty can provide more guidance to students in their writing. One course alone cannot teach writing. Students do write in many of their courses but there needs to be a forum where faculty from across the campus can talk about ways in which they can devise strategies to teach writing, help students to practice writing, instruct in the

process of writing including editing. The more numerous the settings the more the students will learn.

Senator Smith encouraged the committee to go further than just a forum, to be an initiator for curricular and other kinds of actions to improve writing. Don't be content to just be a place to talk about it; also develop proposals that will ultimately come to this body.

Senator Neuhaus commented that with the work on the new Strategic Plan, the LAC, the First Year Council, this is an opportune time for this to be coming back. There will be a lot of initiatives for faculty to try, innovative forms of teaching, disciplines, the barriers may come down a little bit and if so, it's incumbent on a lot of people to take on what they may have thought was someone else's responsibility.

Senator Lowell noted that she does a lot of writing in her classes, teaching grammar because students do not know. As an undergraduate there was a system in place where she went to college where faculty could refer those students with substandard writing skills for a writing course. The faculty here couldn't throw that to the English Department but there are programs online that can essentially do remedial writing. Her idea is that faculty should have some real "teeth" in this writing across the curriculum theory and give faculty the power to refer those students whose writing is totally abysmal, and need help, and require those students to go through some kind of remedial writing program. If we do that as a university that's going to look good to people hiring our students because it would be saying that we make sure our students can write.

Senator Soneson stated that he's very sympathetic about the emphasis on grammar. He believes that taking a foreign language would be very, very helpful for our students because it's in the study of foreign language where you really have to study grammar. It is exceeding helpful for learning our language.

Senator Roth commented that he liked what Senator Lowell said but noted that there are things about online sites that he instinctively doesn't like. What about setting up a mentorship program where the more proficient students actually spend "people" time with students that are struggling?

Senator Lowell responded that she's not really that enamored with online idea but we can't really throw this onto other faculty members to take care of. The UNI Writing Center does something sort of like that, but doesn't do it very well.

Senator Roth continued, noting that sometimes faculty think online things work really well but he hasn't heard any positive things on the science side of it

Dr. Grant stressed that this is something that has to be collectively taken up and addressed by the faculty. The way this is structured attempts to do that, fitting in with the true spirit of liberal arts education. Liberal arts is classically defined as being the tribune of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic. Grammar is important, and you have to know your grammar and mechanics. Grammar, like rhetoric or dialectic, are things that just take a long time. We have a four-year program centered around some of these large abstract concepts and we don't simply say, you have a grammar deficiency, let's identify it, diagnose and remediate. That tends to produce writers who are more engaged and understand the reasons for learning grammar or mechanics, who can see the effects of how people take their writing. The attention to grammar is important, and something we all have to engage in with some sort of consistent terminology so students are on the same page and understand.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas stated that the State of Iowa required middle-level education majors to take at least a one-hour course on grammar. This was discussed with the English Department and what they came up with in Curriculum and Instruction was a one-hour Grammar of Middle Level Educators, which may be a misnomer in that it's grammar for anyone. Initially they made it available only to middle level education majors because there were so many of them. The state then decided that only those educators specializing in language arts needed to take this course. In the next curriculum cycle they will probably be requiring all middle level education majors to take that course. It is a really simplified view of basic grammar and mechanics, what students in grades K - 8th typically need to know. It's not necessarily about composition, because a lot of these students do know how to write well but they don't know why it works. This course, 230:155,

for 1 credit hour, is typically offered for only half a semester, and they have had good response from students. When all majors were required to take it they were quite amazed that they actually understood some of these things now that they're much older.

Chair Wurtz noted that what's she hearing from the Senate is very strong support for this. We are not deciding today on what program to use or what the committee should be doing. The UWC does officially exist but the UNI committee structure has been dormant. Before the semester the Senate will get a handle on the university committee structure. At this point, because we do have people that say they are on the UWC, they really don't need our permission to act as a committee but the Senate can give them our endorsement. This will most probably not be a committee that we would do away with.

Senator Soneson asked if part of the proposal from the ELLWC is to change the structure of the UWC?

Dr. Grant replied that he's not sure, that they would like to get under way and then determine what needs to be done.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that he believes Dr. Grant's concern is that he doesn't know how to get the committee to act. If the Faculty Senate were to say that we want the elected members of the UWC to meet and do what the ELLWC is suggesting, that would be a lot. All of the UWC members have indicated that they are interested in the committee and want to work. The resolution could be to send it on to every member of that committee, letting them know that Dr. Grant will be convening the UWC, and it needs to do some procedural things such as elect a chair, and that the Senate is directing them to do that.

Senator East suggested if while the Senate is reorganizing things, if the UWC would like to revisit its charge?

Senator Bruess asked Provost Gibson if it is true that a lot of sections of College Writing and Research are going to be done away with along with Oral Composition because of budgetary reasons?

Provost Gibson responded that they will probably be reduced but they will certainly not be done away with. There are still questions about the budget, and UNI has received some

additional monies but she doesn't know yet how things will look once everything is finalized.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that from the faculty governance perspective, those courses are still in the curriculum and must be offered and the administration has to find the resources to offer them in creative, resourceful, combined ways unless the curriculum is changed. The Faculty Senate could be asked if they want to think of alternatives for that requirement that might be more economically advantageous.

Dr. Grant added that this is something he could see this UWC as doing. They have compared what we're doing here at UNI with peer institutions, not just the Regents peers, to simply get a better handle on how similar types of institutions with similar student bodies approach this. That doesn't mean that we're going to do it like they do it, or that we should, but it gives ideas as to how things can be done differently.

Provost Gibson noted that she believes the LAC Committee is also looking at writing.

Senator Smith also noted that this is one of the major issues the LAC Steering Committee is taking on. They're looking at whether we can get high quality writing from our students in a way that's more economical.

Chair Wurtz stated that the UWC certainly doesn't need the Faculty Senate's permission; what would be useful from us for them to progress to the next step?

Dr. Grant suggested perhaps a resolution stating that the Senate has giving its support.

Senator Neuhaus noted that in the proposal provided to the Senate, the ELLWC would like to "formally restart"; can the Senate declare this formally restarted?

Faculty Chair Swan suggested amending the motion to approve to move to send this to the UWC and ask for a report back.

Senator East, who made the motion, and Senator Neuhaus who made the second agreed with the amending the motion to read, "move to send this back to the ELLWC for them to formally restart the University Writing Committee, sending

them the ELLWC report, and for the University Writing Committee to report back to the Faculty Senate by the end of spring semester with recommendations."

Motion to return this to the English Language and Literature Writing Committee for them to reconvene the University Writing Committee, and for the University Writing Committee to report back to the Faculty Senate by the end of the semester passed with recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

Resolution Regarding Funding of Auxiliary Enterprise
Operations at UNI

by

Hans Isakson, Professor
Department of Economics

In the Spring, 2009 semester, the University Faculty Senate passed a resolution that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than a three percent of the General Education Fund, that the savings generated by cutting Auxiliary Enterprise spending be used to maintain the academic integrity of the University, and that this adjustment process be implemented over the next five years.

Since the passage of this resolution, the economic conditions of the State of Iowa have worsened, and the University has suffered several reductions in state appropriations. The University responded to these reductions with several drastic reductions in spending,

including a significant reduction in the salaries of all employees.

Given the adverse impact that the reductions in state appropriations has had on the University, the University Faculty Senate resolves that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than a three percent of the General Education Fund as soon as possible, and that the savings generated by cutting Auxiliary Enterprise spending be used to maintain the academic integrity of the University. The University Faculty Senate further resolves that if state appropriations continue to decline that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be reduced beyond three percent with the savings allocated to the support of the integrity of the academic programs at UNI.

TO: University Faculty Senate
FROM: Liberal Arts Core Committee
SUBJECT: Category 3A (Fine Arts) Review Summary
DATE: January 15, 2010

The Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) discussed and accepted the Category 3A Review Report during the November 21, 2008 LACC meeting. The following is a summary of the key issues raised by the Category 3A Review that the LACC would like to bring to the Senate's attention

As with the case of the 3B review, there were concerns about the lack of actions taken in response to the 2001 review. There was also a great deal of confusion caused by the changing structure of the LAC website which is intended to provide information useful to faculty and staff. The website content should be re-organized with category specific information brought to a more prominent location. The 3A Review Committee suggests that information regarding goals should "be stated clearly, easily accessible online and directed and that it should be outlined for each category and subcategory". The LAC Committee will work to make the website clearer and of greater use to all.

One item on the LAC website referenced by the Review Committee was the draft "Purposes and Goals" statement from 2004. Based upon that statement, the 3A Review Committee put forward that courses in category 3 should achieve the following learning goals:

- Help students to gain awareness of the range and variety of human expression across cultures, art forms and genres.
- Help students to develop an appreciation and understanding of artistic products and the processes by which they were created.
- Help students develop critical skills necessary to analyze, understand and evaluate artistic creations.

The LAC Committee would encourage the faculty teaching the courses in Category 3A to continue to examine methods for assessing student learning of the above stated goals, and to refine the student learning goals using results from student assessments.

The 3A Review Committee also makes the suggestion that the following be used for the statement for syllabi (original statement from the 2004 draft of the LAC Purposes and Goals):

These are human creations that serve expressive or aesthetic purposes. Students should become aware of their range and variety, across cultures, artistic forms, and genres. They should develop an appreciation for and understanding of artistic products and the processes by which they are created. They should be able to analyze and evaluate these creations.

This change will be implemented on the LAC website and provided to instructors for the category.

There are several recommendations from the Category Review Team that do warrant the attention of CHFA faculty and administrators and others in the University community. The LACC supports these recommendations and suggests they be acted on as soon as possible:

- o During the review period, the Art department experienced reduced staffing, which impacted their ability to effectively deliver course content. There were increases in class sizes (approximately 75 students/section) and student activities such as writing assignments, and field trips were curtailed. During the review period, 70% of sections were taught by non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructors.
- o There is a lack of tenured or tenure-track faculty willing or eager to teach courses with large class sizes, particularly when there is still the perception that non-major courses in the LAC are "a

waste of time". The reduction of class sizes will help faculty "connect" with their students and provide greater opportunities for personal interactions, which are generally not possible in large lecture sections.

- o To quote from the report "Creating faculty lines dedicated solely to the LAC is one idea that might be considered. Teaching many LAC classes requires a breadth of knowledge and the ability to reference other fields of study in connection with the content at hand. These skills are necessary if students are to establish meaningful connections with disciplines other than the one they have chosen to study as a major". The LAC Committee would like to strongly endorse this recommendation.
- o Teaching that is "learning-centered" should be investigated in which fine arts instruction is in an active and collaborative environment. This would require smaller class sizes, and it may not be possible to implement this in all areas of category 3A. It is further suggested that such a model could be of benefit to other areas of the LAC and sponsored workshops could help faculty across the university develop such course models. Such a workshop could also help to recruit talented faculty into LAC instruction.

The list of recommendations above includes recommendations that mirror many of those put forward by the 2001 Category Review. In addition to the above issues, the following recommendations from 2001 should also be addressed.

- o Information about the category should be made widely available to the faculty in the category, and they should be encouraged to include at least some direct reference to the goals of the category in their syllabi and courses, as well as the goals of the entire LAC.
- o Instructors who teach different sections of a course should be encouraged to meet periodically to share pedagogy, maintain some degree of consistency according to the category goals, and to share ideas for improving the course. Where possible and feasible, coordinators of multi-section courses should be appointed or elected to help facilitate such meetings.
- o Regular assessment of student learning and perceptions should be undertaken, including assessment after graduation. This will require a careful examination of the student learning goals as was discussed

previously.

The LAC Committee notes that the 3A Review lacks significant contribution from the School of Music and suggests that there be greater discussions not only between individuals within the departments that teach in the category but also across departments. The LAC Committee would encourage the formation of a Category Coordinating Committee (CCC) for category 3 as soon as possible with the goal of increasing communication across department boundaries.

TO: Susan Wurtz, Chair of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Siobahn Morgan, LACC Coordinator

DATE: January 26, 2010

RE: Request to add 200:030 "Dynamics of Human Development" to Category 5B of the Liberal Arts Core

The Liberal Arts Core Committee is asking that the Faculty Senate approve the inclusion of the course 200:030 *Dynamics of Human Development* to Category 5B of the Liberal Arts Core.

Background:

The Liberal Arts Core Committee voted on January 22, 2010 to approve the inclusion of 200:030 "Dynamics of Human Development" to Category 5B of the Liberal Arts Core for those programs that require the course. During the approval process the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the Department of Psychology were consulted. There were concerns raised about the inclusion of the course by the Dean of CSBS and the Category Coordinating Committee of the college. The benefits of including the course into the LAC were also noted, particularly the freeing up of electives for various education majors who are required to complete the course and the general demand on courses in Category 5.

As a course currently required for various education majors it is suggested that the following language be used in advising information -

Education students may use 200:030 to substitute for one course in category 5B.

This statement should be placed after the current statement concerning the economics course.

A copy of the proposal for inclusion of the course into the LAC is included along with several recently used course syllabi.

FACULTY WORKLOAD

UNI's budgetary situation is dire. Indications are that the next fiscal year will be even worse, and there is little hope for much alleviation in the foreseeable future. Organizations have standard ways of responding to severe budgetary pressures. In institutions of higher education, these responses include increasing class sizes, reducing staff, and cutting salaries. UNI has taken such steps and will probably do so again. Unfortunately, though their effects may not be readily apparent, these actions are harmful to the institution's well-being and performance. Moreover, the obviousness and relative ease of implementing such actions can inhibit the university from seeking out alternative courses of action that are less harmful but of comparable budgetary impact. ON such alternative, of clear relevance in UNI's situation, involves faculty workload.

Faculty are the heart of any university. Since they are also a major source of costs, it is to be expected that budgetary crises will inspire efforts to reduce faculty-related costs. UNI's faculty will experience salary and benefit cuts as part of the current budget crisis. While it is appropriate that all elements of the university "share the pain," cost-reduction measures should, whenever possible, focus on the least important of the university's cost-generating activities. Across-the-board cuts to faculty salaries and benefits do not do this; rather than strategically targeting unneeded activities, they indiscriminately tax individuals. Consequently, whenever possible, such cuts should be supplanted by actions that identify less valuable activities and spare those that are essential.

The activities of faculty have traditionally been categorized as teaching, research, and service. Though it is prominent in the workloads of some UNI faculty, service accounts for only 10% of the expected contribution for most. Consequently it will be largely absent from the

discussion and proposals that follow. Teaching, on the other hand, comprises 50% of the normal faculty workload. In addition to generating tuition revenue for the university, teaching prepares our students to be productive members of their society, and it perpetuates the culture that is the essence of that society. Faculty are being productive when they do a great job teaching their students. Of course, they are being more productive if they teach appropriate numbers of students. So one proper target of cost reduction efforts is the elimination of under-sized classes, classes that lack pedagogical or other justifications for serving only a few students. Academic programs that consistently generate such inefficiencies should also be eliminated. To date, UNI administrators have made only token efforts toward this end.

Research, the other major component of a normal faculty workload at UNI, is the central focus of the present initiative. Faculty research and other scholarly activities have a special status in institutions of higher education. These activities are the source of individual and institutional prestige, and of faculty rewards and mobility. As a result of this exalted status, faculty research has become something of a "sacred cow" in higher education, an endeavor whose value is accepted without question. Certainly much research, especially in the physical and biological sciences, has generated enormous societal benefits. Riding the coattails of these highly valuable efforts, a huge amount of academic research in other fields has been supported by society, even though its value—practical or otherwise—is far from apparent. Going along with the glorification of academic research is universal acceptance of publication as the standard of merit: It is assumed that if research is published, it must be both qualitatively good and in some way significant.

That, of course, is academia's official narrative. Though accepted without question by most, some faculty are not convinced that it is true. Some of us believe that a lot of research is conductive merely to generate publications, and that much published research has no identifiable value, practical, cultural, or otherwise. And yet at UNI, as at more research-oriented institutions, faculty are urged to conduct and publish their research, irrespective of its actual or potential value to society.

If UN's scarce financial resources are to be allocated more effectively, so teaching and other valuable activities are protected while not-so-valuable endeavors are cut back, we must call into question the value of faculty research. Arguably, doing so will reveal that a lot of research being done at UNI is not worth doing. In many cases, individual faculty know this and only engage in research because it is required for them to achieve certain rewards.

Thus, the UNI Faculty Senate is asking faculty and administrators to reevaluate the standard workload for tenured faculty at UNI, with the intent of reducing the production or unneeded research, thereby making more faculty time available for teaching and significant service activities. In addition to a general and department-by-department assessment of faculty research, an evaluation should be conducted on a person-by-person basis to determine, in each case, if the volume and significance of research outputs justify the allocation of 40% of that faculty member's professional efforts. In cases where it is determined that a faculty member's research efforts aren't justified, tenured faculty should be encouraged and assisted in finding more productive ways of using their time. As a default, they should be encouraged to teach an extra course each semester. Formal expectations regarding their research productivity should, of course, be reduced. Faculty who revise their workloads in this way should be assured that these revisions enhance, rather than diminish, their value to the university. Workload revisions should not harm a faculty member's eligibility for promotions, merit increases, and other faculty recognitions and rewards. Increased instructional capacity generated by this action should be used to reduce class sizes and the hiring of non-tenured instructors. Financial savings should be used to offset planned reductions in faculty salaries and benefits.

These short-term actions notwithstanding, we must also change UNI's culture, including its reward and recognition practices, to effect a more appropriate valuation of teaching, research, and service, and to insure that research is encouraged and rewarded only insofar as it produces valuable outputs. UN's culture and practices should not impose the research-centric, one-size-fits-all model of faculty performance found at research institutions. To this end, we are asking the Provost to establish a committee to address the larger issues of

faculty workload and performance with the intent of developing proposals which will insure that the time and talents of UNI's faculty are used to the most beneficial effect.